

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morii (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0001776). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a step of forming a conductive film on the surface of the plate by discharging a liquid material using an ink-jet. This subject matter is described throughout the specification and drawings as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Specifically, this subject matter is described at paragraph [0006] of the specification.

Morii does not teach or suggest such a method. That is, Morii fails to teach or suggest a step of forming a conductive film on the surface of the plate by discharging a liquid material using an ink-jet method. Because this subject matter is neither taught nor suggested by Morii, the claimed method would not have been obvious.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the claimed invention relates to a process for providing a hydrophilic property to a plate by irradiating energy light such as UV rays onto the surface of the plate. Variations in the accumulated light intensity of radiation on the surface of the plate are no more than 20%. Morii teaches a process of providing a hydrophobic property to a surface of a plate after providing a hydrophilic property to the surface of the plate. Morii, however, also teaches a process of providing

an uneven surface and a printing form which forms a printing surface. This falls short of the claimed step of forming a conductive film by an ink jet method. Again, because Morii fails to teach or suggest such a step, Applicants respectfully assert that the claimed invention would not have been obvious.

Lastly, Applicants respectfully assert that Morii merely teaches a process of illuminating a laser by simply adjusting its diameter. Adjusting a diameter of a laser, however, falls short of the claimed step of controlling variations in accumulated illumination intensity of the radiation on the surface of the plate to 20% or less. Because this claimed step is insufficiently taught or suggested by Morii, Applicants again respectfully assert that the claimed invention is not obvious in view of Morii.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simonetti (U.S. Pat. No. 6,451,386). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, claim 1 has been amended to recite a step of forming a conductive film by an inkjet method. Simonetti also fails to teach or suggest such a step. Because this step is neither taught nor suggested by Simonetti, Applicants respectfully assert that the claimed invention would not have been obvious.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Simonetti also merely teaches adjusting a diameter of a laser. Again, however, the adjustment of a diameter of a laser falls short of the claimed step of controlling variations in accumulated intensity of the radiation on the surface of the plate to 20% or less. Because changing the diameter of a laser fails to teach or suggest the claimed controlling step, Applicants respectfully assert that the claimed invention would not have been obvious.

With respect to dependent claim 5, this claim recites steps of measuring illumination intensity of the radiation at a plurality of points on the surface of the plate and in a vicinity of the plate before providing the hydrophilic property, and controlling irradiation of the radiation based on the accumulated illumination intensity of the radiation in the vicinity of the plate measured during the process of providing the hydrophilic property. The Examiner alleges that these steps are obvious because Simonetti in Tables 1A and 1B lists the intensities of different bulbs. Notwithstanding, Applicants respectfully assert that the steps of claim 5 recite a measuring illumination intensity at a plurality of points on the surface of the plate and in a vicinity of the plate before providing the hydrophilic property. Merely measuring the intensity of different bulbs, however, does not render obvious the claimed measuring step of claim 5. This is because the intensity of a bulb is not the same as the illumination intensity at a plurality of points on a surface of a plate and in a vicinity of the plate. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that Simonetti does not render the subject matter of claim 5 obvious.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,861,377. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants elect to defer the filing of a terminal disclaimer until the Examiner considers the claims, as amended.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept. 28, 2005

By:



G. Gregory Schivley

Reg. No. 27,382

Bryant E. Wade

Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/JAH